

COMMITTEE ON HUMAN RESOURCES/INSURANCE

March 15, 2005

5:45 PM

Chairman Shea called the meeting to order.

The Clerk called the roll.

Present: Aldermen Shea, Sysyn, DeVries, Garrity, Forest

Messrs.: V. Lamberton, R. Ludwig, P. Martineau, T. Seigle, T. Lolicata

Chairman Shea addressed Item 3 of the agenda:

Communication from Virginia Lamberton, Human Resources Director, submitting a response from the Hay Group for an RFI to conduct a review of components of the City's classification, job evaluation and compensation plan and advising that an additional \$52,000 to \$55,000 is required in either the FY2005 or FY2006 budgets should the Board wish to pursue this project.

Alderman DeVries stated I am hoping that Ms. Lamberton can give us a run down of what she expects we would see from the job evaluation so that we are all on the same page.

Virginia Lamberton, HR Director, stated if we were to go forward with this the Hay Group would be required to sign a contract that they would do all of the four items here that have bullets. For the amount of money that they have proposed I would find it hard to believe that they were going to do an in-depth review of all of the jobs in the City. As a matter of fact, that probably would not be likely. What they would be doing is looking at our point factor system to determine whether or not it is valid. They might do some random audits of different jobs but they would not do what you had done in the late 90's for that amount of money.

Alderman DeVries stated there also had been some discussion as to where the combination of steps and COLA have left us as far as pay equity. Are we going to see that evaluated?

Ms. Lamberton responded I think that we would see that by having them do...I think that always ends up in the discussion of do the City of Manchester employees make more than they should or more than other municipalities. Do you agree with that?

Alderman DeVries replied could you say that again.

Ms. Lamberton stated I think that when we talk about the salary matrix and the different steps and the different way we can get steps that the bottom line to all of that is do the City of Manchester employees make more money than their peers in other communities or municipalities. That is just an assumption on my part. I thought that part of this was to have a comprehensive salary comparison done with other similar jobs in municipalities that were similar to ours with similar duties to determine whether or not the positions were receiving higher compensation than other municipalities. A salary survey basically.

Alderman Forest asked is this something that we have asked to be done as a Committee. Is this for the RFP for the RFI that we sent out?

Ms. Lamberton answered if my memory serves me correctly in December the Mayor...I guess if you look back the Board has often times when things come up that perhaps they find frustrating or during negotiations we have talked about Yarger Decker, Yarger Decker, Yarger Decker and that is costing the City a lot of money. So in December the Mayor wrote the full Board a letter saying okay let's find out if the real problem here is Yarger Decker so lets put out an RFP or an RFI and find out whether or not anybody can come in here and do an analysis of what we do and how we compensate our employees and the Board did vote for that, which is why the RFI went out.

Alderman Forest stated if I recall we voted on this...would this \$52,000 be over and above something we have already authorized.

Ms. Lamberton responded you haven't authorized any money to be spent. That was one of our discussions too was who is going to pay for this.

Chairman Shea stated we have a person, Kevin Buckley, who does certain types of work for the City and judging from the type of questions that you have highlighted here would he be in a position to do something of that sort if we so desired.

Ms. Lamberton responded with all due respect to Kevin, who I think highly of, that would not be his area of expertise to do this kind of stuff. When you are asking for somebody to determine whether or not your point factor system is a valid system or not that is a whole profession in and of itself frankly.

Chairman Shea asked he wouldn't be able to go through this and compare we'll say existing compensation rates for different pay scales depending upon the existing market and so forth. You have highlighted here "review the existing compensation system to determine generally where the City's pay grades are with

respect to existing public market rates to include a meaningful salary survey.”
Couldn’t he do that? Isn’t that part of an auditor’s type of responsibility?

Ms. Lamberton answered I would say not really. He could try but that is really not his area of expertise to my knowledge.

Chairman Shea asked but that is your opinion right.

Ms. Lamberton answered yes.

Chairman Shea stated the other is “review the City’s current pay system for part-time employees.” He couldn’t do that?

Ms. Lamberton responded remember that we were talking about doing that as part of the survey with other municipalities to see what the other municipalities do for their part-time employees. If you recall this came about because we changed an ordinance almost three years ago now saying that part-time employees had to work the same number of hours as full-time employees worked in order to receive a merit step increase and the Tax Collector wanted that to be changed so the end result of our discussions with the Tax Collector was well let’s throw that into this RFI and see if during a salary survey they can do that as part of this study as well.

Chairman Shea stated what I am trying to reason is that this particular \$52,000 to \$55,000 I know at one time you made the statement I believe that a sound type of situation would cost upwards...and I may be misquoting but I thought you said between \$200,000 and \$300,000. I thought you said that at a particular juncture when we were discussing this.

Ms. Lamberton responded you are absolutely correct. I almost fell off of my chair when I saw the \$52,000 to \$55,000 to be honest with you. I was shocked to see it that low. I just was shocked.

Chairman Shea stated but this to me seems like they are going to come in and kind of go through what is available and we are going to pay them \$55,000 and they are going to leave and we aren’t going to be better off than we were before. That is my opinion. It is just going to be reviewing what is already existing and saying give me the material, we will look at it and say this is okay or not this is not okay and so forth. That is the way I reason this but maybe the other members of the Committee have other comments. That is the way I look at it.

Ms. Lamberton replied I don’t think your observation is unreasonable. What I try to remind the full Board is that the Yarger Decker, the end result of that is that we have a salary grade matrix of 34 grades and 13 steps and every review of that in

the world isn't going to change that unless the unions agree to that. That is the bottom line. So we are trying to figure out okay within the system we have are the things we are doing valid. Concerns about whether a department head is overpaid for their level of responsibility seems to be an issue from time to time and that was all part and parcel to this proposal.

Chairman Shea stated and I might add that that should be decided at the Board level. In other words if a particular department head feels that he or she is underpaid and comes in with a valid situation and the Board decides on the basis of the information whether that particular department head should or should not or any other employee should or should not receive additional compensation I don't think we need somebody to come in and tell us that. I think that ultimately whatever they tell us here it is still the Board's decision to make a judgement concerning specific and particular matters. That is my opinion and that is why I wasn't necessarily in favor of prolonging the agony when we decided to do this.

Alderman Forest stated again I have a comment. Since I have been an Alderman for a little under four years I have heard complaints from almost every member of the Board about Yarger Decker. Yarger Decker has been in effect I believe six or seven years. I personally believe that the bugs in Yarger Decker are probably 98% out. The cost of Yarger Decker to the City of Manchester has pretty much run its course but I have been hearing Aldermen complaining about Yarger Decker. This was voted in to come up with a solution...whether it is right or wrong, we voted on this and I personally feel that we should support this and get it over with and then we can move on and do something that is constructive instead of complaining all of the time. That is my comment and I will vote in favor of this.

Alderman DeVries stated when I look at item 2, gathering data, I don't see that we will be doing an in-depth desk audit to review the existing. We will be looking at the sheets that have already been established by your office to review the grade to see if they are still applicable. Is that how you read that?

Ms. Lamberton responded there are different ways to work with a consultant like this. One of them would be to, which should be happening anyway frankly, ask departments to look at their class specifications to make sure they are up-to-date and accurate. Then assuming that that exercise happens then you provide the consultants with the updated class specifications and then they do a paper review basically within the point factor system and the organizational structure within departments and then compare them to other departments. You can do a paper study if all of the information they had was up-to-date and accurate.

Alderman DeVries asked is that any different than the review that you do when a position becomes vacant.

Ms. Lamberton answered we do more than paper. We go out and talk to the employee. We verify the duties. Sometimes people don't give you all of the information they should, which helps their position. That is the best way to do it is to do what we call a desk audit.

Alderman DeVries asked in your opinion if we were to find a specific job that is reviewed that has been over graded have you seen in the past a willingness to downgrade an existing position.

Ms. Lamberton asked by the Board.

Alderman DeVries answered by any Board. I know you have been here for four years now.

Ms. Lamberton responded my observation has been that the Board has allowed the incumbents in the position to retain their salary and continue to get their step but the position gets moved down and when the incumbents vacate the position, the position is posted and recruited at the rate that it should be at. There hasn't been any negative impact on the incumbents.

Alderman DeVries asked is the majority of the \$52,000 that we would be paying to select that information and organize it and to spit out some recommendations to the Board or do you feel that the majority of the cost of this analysis would be in checking with the surrounding communities and other places.

Ms. Lamberton replied actually the requirement of them was to give us timetables for every component of this and I didn't look at it before I came. I apologize.

Alderman DeVries stated I wasn't worried as much about the timeline as...my concern is that if we are paying \$52,000, the majority of which is going to be telling us whether or not the current grades applied to positions have been factored correctly, if past experience has always proven that until there is a vacancy we don't act on that I am wondering if it is a best use of our \$52,000 or if this Board wants to face reality and say what we are really looking to see is are we in beat with the surrounding communities with like and similar jobs would that cost considerably less to just do that piece of the study.

Ms. Lamberton responded I know it would cost less based on the response from \$52,000 to \$55,000 for all of this stuff. Precisely how much I would really have to go through the attachments to find out how much they said or what percentage of the budget they were talking about.

Alderman DeVries stated I would be interested in knowing that. If not for tonight maybe for another meeting.

Ms. Lamberton replied I will write you a note.

Alderman Lopez stated a couple of my questions have already been answered and there were some very good questions by Alderman DeVries. I guess what I am wondering is do we already know the end result? Do we already know that somebody is going to come in here...I am very surprised that only one person bid on this from California. I guess nobody else in the world wants to tackle such a job. I guess the question I would like to ask is is there any other way Ginny that we could...for example are records in municipalities open to the public. If somebody came to you and asked you for a pay run down and job description for all of your employees what would you tell them?

Ms. Lamberton responded under the Right-to-Know Law we provide that information.

Alderman Lopez asked is there any way that we could look at two or three cities as big as Manchester and spend that money on a committee or something to really look and put something together maybe utilizing staff that we have. The most complaints I get is we continue and where is the end. There is no end. People will tell you that there is an end but there is no end. We continue to hire people at higher salaries when people leave. We don't lower the salaries. We keep adding more responsibility. I believe we should have accountability. I am just wondering where is the end. The end result after we get all of this information is not all of the City employees or categories that you are going to get. Are they just going to verify yes you have a good system and it is working? When Yarger Decker was given to the City there are people today that would not publicly say this was a really bad move because forever you are talking about a 5% increase with a 2% COLA and you are talking about top management getting that. There is no review process to a degree. In the political world for managers to be totally accountable there is something that a CEO fills out and says yes I did a good job and you get your money and that is it. That is not a derogatory remark. I think that in corporations managers are treated a little differently because of the education qualifications. They produce first and then they get rewarded. I was wondering if there was some other way that you know of with your experience that we could accomplish this and maybe utilize that money collectively or send Christine or staff or a group of people...I am sure there are people in the community who could do something like this. I hate to see the end result...get this guy from California to come here and we spend \$52,000 and he tells us what we already know.

Ms. Lamberton stated I will answer your questions a couple of ways. Professionally I know of the Hay Group and they won't do that. They will tell you like it is. I understand that they did the City of Nashua several years ago but I don't know whether Nashua is happy with that or unhappy with that. I know that they did Nashua. I know that they did the State of New Hampshire several years ago and the state was happy with that to the point that you can be happy.

Alderman Lopez asked what did they do.

Ms. Lamberton answered they changed jobs around. They took some jobs and moved them down and moved others up or recommend that. The Legislature had to approve that just as this legislative body would have to approve something here. If you want a salary survey done, my office can do that but I would want you to tell me what job titles you are interested in and we will throw in some other ones and then give me some time to do that because I would really want to make sure that when I am doing a salary survey I am not calling the Town of Deering to find out what their Chief Engineer makes compared to the City of Manchester. I think it is fair for me to call a city that has the same or equal level of responsibility and that would really take more time to find that out. We could do that but it won't happen in 30 days I can tell you that. We could do that if that is what you want with our staff.

Alderman Lopez stated I agree with you. I think if you have discussions around and I am not going to mention any names because it would be inappropriate for me but people who have been hired in the City of Manchester that come from other parts of NH and around the country and I know people who come from the state that were making a lot less money in the same kind of job to a degree and they were doing it at the state and now they are doing it in the city for more. That is just a point that I wanted to bring up. I don't know the answer. I don't think anybody knows the answer. I think we know the end result is going to be that you have a good system but you have to do this and you have to do that and then are we willing to do it. We went through that process with two or three positions here in the City and grandfathered them in and end of ballgame.

Alderman Garrity moved to receive and file. Alderman DeVries duly seconded the motion.

Alderman DeVries stated I am not opposed to the receive and file and I think part of it is because it is a difficult budget year and the \$52,000 is not something that I see as a priority when we are scrambling for funds to cover our other safety functions in the City. There are a couple of things that we as a Committee rolled into this report hoping to have answered and the part-time employee piece is one

of them. I would ask that those not disappear forever and that we take them up at our next meeting and deal with them one way or the other.

Chairman Shea called for a vote. The motion carried with Alderman Forest being duly recorded in opposition.

Chairman Shea addressed Item 4 of the agenda:

Communication from Virginia Lamberton, HR Director, recommending that a request to reclassify a Recreation Maintenance Worker I (Grade 13) to a Ski/Aquatics Maintenance Worker (Grade 15) be approved.

Alderman Garrity asked Mr. Ludwig to come forward. I would assume that the fiscal impact comes out of the Enterprise fund right?

Ronald Ludwig, Parks, Recreation & Cemeteries Director responded yes.

Alderman Garrity asked what is the fiscal impact on a yearly basis.

Mr. Ludwig responded this is minimal impact. Probably somewhere between \$3,000 and \$5,000.

Alderman DeVries stated what caught my attention actually within the job description is there is referencing to collecting fees, balancing comp funds, deposit reconciliation and it calls for a substantial knowledge of accounts processing procedures. I guess my concern was as we listened to the different auditors come before us we have been educated that they always look to have a level of accountability where there are several people. One receiving the funds and the other accounting for the funds and I am not an accountant so don't ask me to explain that perfectly but this job description seems to be contrary to the philosophy that the City auditors have put before us and I wanted to know who has reviewed this to see if we are setting up a system that is a correct accounting system that will stand up in the face of an internal audit or will we just receive a recommendation that one person needs to receive the funds and another person has to account for and deposit the funds.

Mr. Ludwig responded I am not sure if any one in this room knows how the operation at McIntyre Ski Area works. This is really kind of a unique position. The person above this position is actually a Grade 18, which is not that high a level either. He is a one-person department at the present time so when he is not at McIntyre overseeing the millions of dollars of equipment that we have up there and also the funds that come into McIntyre in terms of...I think if I am trying to hone in on what your question is that accountability goes from a full-time

employee at a Grade Level 18 down to a part-time employee handling funds and bringing them up to our office and that, in itself, is not the main concern of this request. It goes more towards the liability issues that are associated with running the ski area and the swimming pools in the absence of the Director. I am not sure if I am answering your question, Alderman DeVries, but this person is more of a manager...well not a manager but overseeing the facility in the absence of the Ski Director when he isn't on-site in terms of snow making and in terms of the machinery and the ski lifts and everything that goes on at McIntyre. Secondly, when I looked at this position I found that the incumbent in the Grade 18, the so-called Director position which was my position when I started with the City from 1974-1982 was working in excess of 84 hours a week and sleeping at the ski area and I didn't think that was a good idea.

Alderman DeVries stated my question specifically is will this person be the person collecting fees when he is in this supervisory role.

Mr. Ludwig responded we actually have cashiers and they are part-time people who collect fees and account for the fees two or three times daily depending if there is an afternoon, evening and night time session but this person would be the one who ultimately would take those fees and deposit them in the office with us yes.

Alderman DeVries asked do we need to adjust this job description because it clearly seems to be saying that this is the person collecting the fees as well as balancing the accounts. My concern is only should there ever be an audit that recommends that you have the separation of those two if it is written into the job description is that going to make it difficult for us to clarify that it is not part of his duty.

Ms. Lamberton answered I think your observation is a really good one but I think it is a matter of how one reads this. You have cashiers who are actually collecting the fees from the customers and then you have either this classification or the Supervisor classification depending on who is on duty who goes around and collects the money from the people who have already collected the money so they would be literally collecting the money from the cashiers but they are not collecting the money from the customer.

Alderman DeVries stated so maybe it is just a redundancy of collects and probably there was a better verb that could have been used. As long as that won't prohibit us from any action.

Ms. Lamberton responded no it wouldn't.

On motion of Alderman DeVries, duly seconded by Alderman Sysyn it was voted to accept the recommendation to reclassify a Recreation Maintenance Worker I (Grade 13) to a Ski/Aquatics Maintenance Worker (Grade 15).

Chairman Shea addressed Items 5 and 6 of the agenda:

Communication from Virginia Lamberton, HR Director, on behalf of Thomas Seigle of EPD recommending a few small changes to the class specifications of the WWTP Operator (Laborer) and the WWTP Shift Supervisor.

Communication from Virginia Lamberton, HR Director, on behalf of Thomas Seigle of EPD recommending the establishment of a new class specification, WWTP Operator Trainee.

Chairman Shea called Thomas Seigle forward.

Alderman DeVries stated while he is up here can we talk about Item 6 at the same time. My questions are intertwined. When I reviewed the two specifications that are before me I noticed that one is a Grade 15 and one is a Grade 18. The job specifications were essentially the same except the next class under Item 6 that we will be looking at is a trainee position. Is that correct?

Thomas Seigle, Chief Sanitary Engineer, answered the Shift Supervisor is one grade and the WasteWater Treatment Operator is another grade. In Item 6 what we are asking for is a lower grade for a trainee. It is kind of similar to what the Manchester Water Works has in their organization.

Alderman DeVries stated I didn't catch many differences in there except that they would be going for some classes or something.

Mr. Seigle responded a Shift Supervisor basically...we have four three-man crews at the treatment plant and they work 24 hours a day, 365 days a year. So there is a Shift Supervisor and two Operators on each crew. The Shift Supervisor is the person responsible for the operation during that 12-hour shift and the two Operators perform various tasks under him. Right now we are having a serious crisis recruiting treatment plant operators. I have three vacant operator positions right now. We have been recruiting for about a year and haven't been able to fill them. What we are asking for in Item 5 is to change the Operator requirements. We are asking to change the Shift Supervisor license from a Grade 4 to a Grade 2 and we are asking to change the Operator license from a Grade 2 to a state certification and the other thing on the Laborer is something minor. Then the Trainee what we are asking for is we have talked to the union representative and to

David Hodgen and we are trying to establish a trainee position where we can bring someone in who has no certification, put them through an 18-month training program and hopefully have a feeder system for our operators. What we had to negotiate was an 18-month probationary period because we wanted to give the person two changes to pass the state exam and if they don't pass it or they refuse to take the job after they pass it they will be terminated.

Alderman DeVries stated I have some follow-up questions and I will switch to the HR Director. I guess what caught my eye is when you look at the Operator position in Item 5 and compare it to the Trainee position in Item 6 they are essentially the same except for as you mentioned the time to train and the job functions to gain that certification. It just made me pause to consider the weight of the licensing and/or certification. Apparently it is worth three grades between the Trainee position in Item 6.

Mr. Seigle interjected we are trying to recruit people from within, maybe from the Highway Department who would want to come down and train at EPD so that is why we selected and recommended a Grade 13 – somewhere between a laborer and an operator.

Alderman DeVries stated so I guess my question for the HR Director is if that is the distinguishing feature, the certification, dropping this from licensing to certification like we are doing are we dropping it at an appropriate...are we adjusting the grade for that piece or...

Mr. Seigle interjected let me go back one step. There are four grades of NH certification or license, 1-4. So we are asking for the Supervisor's requirement to be a NH Grade 2 and the Operator to be a NH Grade 1 essentially and then the Trainee would have no certification requirements.

Ms. Lamberton stated I think we are confusing grades here. You are talking about grades for certification and Alderman DeVries is talking about salary grades. Yes, there is a good enough span there and if you will note in the class specification for the trainee we put in there consistently that they be under the supervision of somebody who is licensed and at some point they will be given their wings as they are fully trained and then what would really happen here is we are not creating a new position in numbers. What we are saying is that a Waste Water Treatment Operator can be downgraded to the Trainee level so we can bring people in at the Grade 13 level and as they gain experience and certification we can move them up to the Grade 15 level.

Alderman DeVries stated I understand. There is a vacancy that occurs there today that you are trying to fill and you are trying to creatively find a way to do some in-

house training and that is a good thing. I am not trying to argue with that. It just made me...when I looked at in your terminology the grading for the license certification not being required coming in at a Grade 13 salary level versus a prior item where it has been downgraded from a...I think it was described as a license to a certification only at the State DES language. I am just wondering have we adjusted this appropriately.

Ms. Lamberton asked have we moved it down low enough. Based on the other duties and considering that it would be an 18 month phasing in when we were looking at it and analyzing it we felt that the Grade 13 was the appropriate grade to put the Trainee level at.

Alderman DeVries stated if I could ask one final question on Item 6 and I realize that I have merged these horribly but while we are talking about the Trainee position and the 18 months that is envisioned to allow this person to be a trainee is that in conflict with the one year probationary status in the City.

Ms. Lamberton responded it could have been but apparently the Highway Department has met with the union and the union concurs with this and they would agree to an 18-month probationary period for this trainee position. Correct?

Mr. Seigle replied yes that is correct.

Alderman DeVries asked so if after 18 months they are not able to gain that certification than they could be let go.

Mr. Seigle answered that is correct.

Ms. Lamberton stated I think the 18 months is to give them every advantage they can possibly give them. Let's say the person is really nervous or something and the first time they take the exam they flunk it but they are really doing a good job. It would be unfortunate that we would have to terminate them rather than let them take the exam again.

On motion of Alderman Garrity, duly seconded by Alderman DeVries it was voted to approve the changes to the WWTP Operator (Laborer) and the WWTP Shift Supervisor class specifications.

On motion of Alderman Forest, duly seconded by Alderman DeVries it was voted to approve the establishment of a new class specification, WWTP Operator Trainee.

Chairman Shea addressed Item 7 of the agenda:

Communication from Virginia Lamberton, HR Director, advising that the organizational structure does not support Welfare Commissioner Martineau's proposal to reclassify two Welfare Specialist II (Grade 18) to two Welfare Specialist III (Grade 20) positions and recommends the establishment of one Welfare Supervisor position (grade 20).

Paul Martineau, Welfare Commissioner, stated everybody talks about running the City like a business. In reorganization in the private sector it means cutbacks and lay-offs. In government it usually means more staff and raises for management. I have eliminated a position and saved a substantial amount of money. If I had requested a Deputy when she took another position, I would have been able to fill that position and I could have justified it and I could have also justified a Welfare Specialist III. The department used to have a Deputy and a Welfare Specialist III. I did away with the Deputy position, which would have cost approximately \$50,000 in salary and \$17,000 in benefits. That is \$67,000 assuming that person came in at the base step. I spoke to the person doing the desk audit, requesting to speak to her prior to making the desk audit. I was assured I would be able to. The desk audit was conducted and again I requested to speak to the interviewer and explain my reorganization prior to her making the recommendation. I wasn't given the courtesy of having any input in this process. As a department head, I had no say in the process. There is something wrong with that approach. The interviewer spoke with both candidates approximately two hours. I have been working with these individuals for over three years. Who knows more about how to run my department than I do? Let's talk about saving money. By making two key positions in my department Welfare Specialist III's, the individual that I name as my designee has worked for the City for 15 years. By making her a III it means a pay increase of \$2,300 a year plus \$805 in benefits for a total of \$3,105. She will be the second in command and in charge during my absence. She is my triage person. She interviews applicants initially and determines if it is an emergency or if she can refer them to another agency or if she can get them relief. We save the City thousands of dollars every month. You were provided her scope of duties and the responses to her HR questionnaire that she completed. She does training. She coordinates the workflow. She evaluates new Welfare Specialists on their interviewing abilities at the reception area and she would be the person in charge in my absence. You know there isn't a day that goes by that she leaves at 5 PM. My people come in early. Sometimes they work through lunch. They stay after 5 PM. They do what has to be done and they are exempt employees, which means that they don't get paid for overtime. The other person has been working part-time, 30 hours, for the City for 10 years. She is in charge of training the new Welfare Specialists and this is a critical position. It requires expertise and knowledge of state statutes and our guidelines. As a matter of fact both of them are presently working with me on updating our guidelines. By making her a

Welfare Specialist III she will be increasing her work hours to 37.5 per week. This would be an increase of approximately \$10,885 per year and her benefits would be \$2,165 since she doesn't get health or dental for a total of \$13,050. You were provided her scope of duties and responses to the HR questionnaire that she completed. She trains and evaluates these people. She confers with me. Both of them do. Total cost for both is approximately \$16,155. If the cost of the Deputy at the base step is \$67,000 versus the cost of two Welfare Specialist III's, which is \$16,155 it reflects a savings of \$50,845. Since when is saving money not acceptable? I have talked to Manchester businessmen and professionals and taxpayers concerning my reorganization. They agreed that it makes sense besides saving a substantial amount of money. One CEO told me it is a no-brainer. I have heard the Mayor state on several occasions that our department has saved the taxpayers millions of dollars. I take responsibility as an elected official very seriously just like you people do and I am always seeking ways to save the taxpayer money. I can go through prior to my going here the deficit by the previous administration how much I have returned over the two fiscal years – over \$400,000 to the City with the same budget and I have had my budget cut by \$200,000 and \$100,000. I have had revenues of over \$200,000 that I have collected. I think we have worked hard and we have done the job and it is because of the staff that I have that have been doing it. As a matter of fact, my fiscal 2006 proposed operating budget, which you are presently looking at, I have the same operating budget. I don't think there is another department that can do that and if this goes through my payroll budget will go down. There have been many areas in our operation where substantial savings have been generated through the years here – housing, medication, provisions, printing, the work program we reinstituted. We report suspected fraud and we get reimbursement. Not to many City employees are exposed to the verbal abuse that my case workers are subjected to. As a matter of fact today somebody called somebody an f'in ---. Have you been watching the news lately? These are the kind of things that they put up with. If you look at the specifications for the Welfare Specialist III it says the person is the lead worker. Well that is exactly what they are going to be. The only other difference is in training and evaluating, which is what they are doing. A lot of this stuff basically I look at it...you know the current knowledge, etc. is a lot of fluff when the Yarger Decker people were trying to justify whatever it was. What I am saying to you is I feel as though this is merited. It saves the City money. It is organizing my department the way it can best be run. Thank you.

Chairman Shea stated Ginny you sent the members of this Committee a letter. Could you respond?

Ms. Lamberton replied certainly. I would be happy to. The first thing I would like to say is that sometimes it is hard for department heads to understand that when I am responding to their changing the duties of a position I am dealing with

positions. I am not dealing with as they would in the private sector determining whether or not somebody has done such a great job that they should receive more money next year or receive a higher bonus or something. We are in a public system. We have a point factor system. We have 34 grades and it is my responsibility to evaluate positions, not people, positions to determine whether or not the duties that are given or taken away from positions have any impact on the salary grade that is assigned to that position. In this instance, when you look at the Welfare Specialist III, indeed it is supposed to be a lead worker, which means that you have people that you are leading. One of the positions has nobody working for her. She does a great job and Paul has told me that since I met him but that is not what position reviews are about. If that were true, when Welfare was spending more money than they should have been spending would we have reclassified those employees downward? No. The position duties are the position duties. In this instance the woman who is the receptionist who is the first position that he wants as a Welfare Specialist III she only trains people for a period of two or three weeks when they are new employees. They come and sit with her at the front desk and learn what her duties are during that period of time. The second position, which is also a Welfare Specialist II right now, which is a part-time position, that incumbent trains new employees as they come through the system. That is not unique to this position. Any office or any employee in the City is required to train new employees as they come through. It happens that this woman, I believe, is talented and good at that so she is the one who does that all of the time. I asked Paul if she left what would happen and he said well one of the other Welfare Specialists would be required to do the training. That is not again, unique to this department. I also take offense somewhat to what Paul said. Prior to his submitting this request...in fact he and I sat for a period of time and discussed this and then prior to me writing a letter or even telling him my final thoughts on this or what my final recommendations were going to be, I called him and we discussed this again. Obviously he disagrees with me in part because he is looking at savings. Well the classification system...there is no impact on a position whether the positions are spending more money than they should or less money than they should. That is not part of the classification system. So, as a compromise to me because I believe that he needs a second position to be in charge when he is not available or he is not there and at meetings or something. We have a job title on the books called Welfare Supervisor and that is a Grade 20 and that is my recommendation to you because it would meet those needs of having somebody in charge in his absence, being a lead worker and being able to do performance evaluations. The point factors support that and if you look at the organizational chart, the chart would support that as well. He could post it and he could select one of his current employees to be in that role for the department. Right now you look at a salary Grade 20 in other departments and you are talking about positions that have a lot more responsibility than these positions would have for being supervisors or engineers or Masters level employees. That is not the

case here. So I am not looking just at Welfare, I am looking at those positions in relative terms to other departments as far as salary Grade 20 goes.

Chairman Shea asked if somebody is graded a certain point or a certain level you are saying that that could impact other people. I know that we had a run on the bank a few years back when certain people in a certain department were upgraded and then we had upwards of 135 people saying well if this person goes from a Grade 18 to Grade 20 then why shouldn't I go from a Grade 18 to a Grade 20 is that what you are saying or am I misreading you.

Ms. Lamberton answered I was not saying that but certainly that is a possibility. I have seen that happen. I haven't seen that happen here, but I have seen that happen.

Chairman Shea stated I recall that happening when I was on the Human Resources...

Ms. Lamberton responded what I am saying is that a department head gives work assignments and then if he or she believes that giving those work assignments or taking work assignments away or if the employee believes that that is impacting on his or her salary grade our office will go out and do a desk audit and find out the duties and find out whether or not the added or subtracted duties have an impact on the salary grade that is assigned to that position. If we believe that it does, then we will come here and recommend that the position grade go up. If we think it is going down then we will do the same thing. I will come to you and say based on the duties being taken away it would be my recommendation that you lower the grade of the position. So it goes both ways.

Alderman Garrity stated I already have an opinion on this item. Ms. Lamberton already stated that she looks at positions and not people and I think that is why Alderman Porter and myself brought in an ordinance change looking at people not positions strictly when you are hiring laborers and things like that. Commissioner Martineau has a track record of success at the Welfare Department. He is saving the City money and running an efficient department. We pay our department heads handsomely and I think it is time we let them start running their departments appropriately instead of one person in the Human Resources Department.

Alderman Garrity moved to approve the request to reclassify two Welfare Special II positions to Welfare Specialist III's. Alderman Sysyn duly seconded the motion. Chairman Shea called for a vote. The motion carried with Aldermen DeVries and Shea duly recorded in opposition.

Chairman Shea addressed Item 8 of the agenda:

Communication from Tom Lolicata, Traffic Director, requesting the reinstatement of a Traffic Signal Technician position which had been temporarily approved on November 15, 2004.

Thomas Lolicata, Traffic Director, stated in this particular case it started off with a complete miscommunication between the Mayor's Office, my office and Ginny's office. We were under the impression that this was a vacated position, not a new one. I have had a third person for awhile and we couldn't get a Signal Technician three years ago. In the interim something came up by which we lost a person temporarily and I was in dire needs of getting that Signal Technician moved and getting somebody in there. We got a person hired. I went to the Mayor's office first and then Ginny thinking of it as a vacated position and all of the paperwork didn't say anything differently. I was then told that it couldn't be a vacated position because supposedly it was abolished. Well, I always thought I had a complement of 17 people. I had 20 in 1990. I lost three people and then I had 17 and we sat down with Virginia and she explained to me that if the money is not in the budget, the position gets abolished, which I was not aware of. So all of the paperwork that we sent through asked for a full-time vacated position and that is how this all came about. We hired a person for three months who has a Master's Degree because the other Signal Technician has been in and out due to a serious injury and now I am coming before you to ask if you will give me permission to go forward and have this Signal Technician stay with us as a permanent member.

Alderman Garrity asked do you have the money in your budget.

Mr. Lolicata answered yes we do.

Alderman DeVries asked can you tell me the duties of the Signal Technician just briefly. Is this a person that is coordinating all of the traffic signals in the City and adjusting the computer for timing?

Mr. Lolicata answered yes they do all of those things because they are qualified. This one came in qualified, which is a very rare thing. If I had a new person starting out he would have to go through almost a whole year to get an apprenticeship and go to electrical school, etc. What they do is maintain all of your lights and it is really a complicated matter. It is not like going into a box and working with three wires. They have to take care of anything below that like painting and signage, etc. with the other fellows but their main concern is the lights. All I can tell you is that they do the complete installation and maintenance of all of the traffic signals in the City. A City this size...I made some inquires and a City this size should have at least four Signal Technicians. We have worked with two and three for the last eight to ten years.

Alderman Forest asked has this person been working for you since November.

Mr. Lolicata answered yes.

Alderman Forest asked and who told you he can no longer work because the job is abolished.

Mr. Lolicata answered we thought it was all set.

Alderman Forest asked so you are just asking us to legalize the position that is already there.

Mr. Lolicata answered yes.

Alderman Forest moved to reinstate the Traffic Signal Technician position in the Traffic Department. Alderman Sysyn duly seconded the motion. Chairman Shea called for a vote. There being none opposed, the motion carried.

TABLED ITEMS

9. Communication from Joan Porter, Tax Collector, relative to part-time employees.

This item remained on the table.

10. Communication from Virginia Lamberton, HR Director, on behalf of the Planning Director recommending that an Administrative Assistant position, salary grade 13, be reclassified to a Planning Technician, salary grade 14.

This item remained on the table.

There being no further business, on motion of Alderman Garrity, duly seconded by Alderman DeVries it was voted to adjourn.

A True Record. Attest.

Clerk of Committee